

**REMARKS**

Claims 1, 2 and 4-9 are pending and under consideration. The Office Action mailed on February 15, 2007 rejected claims 1, 2 and 4-9 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Gilbert and Shaughnessy et al. All rejections are traversed below and reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Page 4 of the Office Action cited Shaughnessy et al. as teaching or suggesting the deficiencies in Gilbert. However, Gilbert and Shaughnessy et al., individually or in combination do not teach "the keyword information is designated by the sender and different for respective receivers" as recited, for example, in lines 5-6 of claim 1. The Office Action acknowledged Gilbert did not teach or suggest lines 5-6 of claim 1 on page 4, at lines 13-16. Shaughnessy et al. merely discloses "selecting portions of a message to transmit as a function of certain keywords present in the text message" in column 5, at lines 15-13 and is silent regarding whether "the keyword information is ... different for respective receivers" recited in lines 5-6 of claim 1. Therefore, it is submitted that claim 1 and claim 2, which depends therefrom and adds further patentably distinctions, are patentably distinguishable over the cited prior art. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claim 4 recites "the keyword information is designated by the sender and different for respective receivers" at lines 4-5. Claims 5 recites "emphasizing and highlighting the different parts of transmission information for respective receivers with information independent of the transmission information" at lines 4-5. Claim 6 recites "emphasizing the transmission information for respective receivers with information independent of the transmission information" at lines 4-5. Claim 7 recites "emphasizing means for emphasizing the transmission information for respective receivers with information independent of the transmission information, and preparing E-mail information for respective receiver" at lines 4-6. Claim 8 recites "emphasizing and highlighting the different parts of transmission information for respective receiver computers with information independent of the transmission information and preparing E-mail information for respective receiver computers" at lines 6-8. Claim 9 recites "emphasizing the different parts responsive to the destinations with information independent of the receiving information" at lines 3-4. In each of the above recited claims, keyword information or emphasizing information is correlated to a receiver. For the reasons discussed above, it is submitted that claims 4-9 are patentably distinguishable over the cited prior art. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Serial No. 09/781,329

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: 05/15/07

By: David E. Moore  
David E. Moore  
Registration No. 59,047

1201 New York Avenue, NW, 7th Floor  
Washington, D.C. 20005  
Telephone: (202) 434-1500  
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501